

Date: Fri, 14 May 93 04:30:22 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #143
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 14 May 93 Volume 93 : Issue 143

Today's Topics:

 Benefits of CW (was in .misc)
 Should auto mechanics learn how to shoe horses? (3 msgs)
 what is the issue here? (WAS: no-code defense) (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 13 May 1993 08:39:01 GMT
From: gumby!destroyer!cs.ubc.ca!newsserver.sfu.ca!sfu.ca!tpang@yale.arpa
Subject: Benefits of CW (was in .misc)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.misc you write:

First of all, why don't you post to r.r.a.policy instead?

>What is the purpose of code? Besides being "fun" and a hobby, CW has
>a niche in amateur radio for technical reasons.

I can say there is a niche for any mode, and fun and a hobby.

>It is still true that CW is a more reliable method of communication
>than phone or any other type of emission readily available to amateur
>radio. I say readily, because there are some spread spectrum and
>digital modulation methods with large coding gains that will beat out
>CW, but I can probably count on my fingers the number of hams that
>have such equipment.

Only in marginal conditions...

>CW is a reliable method of communication when the received
>S/N ratio is around 0 dB. Voice just doesn't work.

Yes, as I said, it has an edge out only on that particular marginal condition.

>WHY is this important? Because an important aspect of ham radio
>is that of emergency communications. Under adverse conditions,
>it is of great utility (IMHO) to have a means of communicating
>(albeit inefficiently vs. phone) with minimum received signal
>strength. It may be due to lack of a good antenna, poor propagation,
>or any other reason, but the key here is that you can communicate with
>CW under conditions where voice would be unintelligible. If all
>one does is ragchew, then big deal. But, if it's an emergency,
>it IS a big deal. THIS IS WHY CW (and CODE) is IMPORTANT to Ham
>Radio.

I recalled most recent emergency (disasters) communications do not rely on CW, but on voice and packet. Can you make an example where there has a need to use CW? For the guy who is calling for help, now that's a different picture. What I mean is: only for certain kind of emergency need.

>There is an unwritten agreement between the band allocating
>agencies and the ham radio community to give them that spectrum
>in return for community good.

So?..

>Code is NOT a good filter to keep "CBers" off the airwaves. There may
>be a very mild correlation between good operating procedures and
>code skill, but to justify code exams based on that is a poor idea.

I say code is a good filter to keep anybody but the very very enthusiastic ham-wannabe. It's like joining a fraternity, you have to memorize their "book", even you might not need the info in there (not that is no use info, it contains the history of the fraternity, etc). It has kept me off for many years when I was living in San Diego, just because I could not make such commitment to spend time to practice my code, although for theory, I know up to Extra level. (I just got my Advanced here, no code needed, but I intend to get my code with 12 wpm, but if it was like in US, I'd probably not even get the code-required class for first time).

>Having said this, I support No-Code, with a caveat. No-code
>licenses should expire after some time. Renewal would require
>the 5 wpm (Element 1A) test be passed. No-code licenses should
>be an entry way into a hobby. If the person is enthused enough

>about it, s/he will learn the code. Netland has stats about

Exactly what I just said above, it is a filter afterall, you see.

>some 65% of no-codes upgrading. If the no-code doesn't want to
>spend time upgrading, then the ticket expires. THAT should be
>the filter -- self generated interest in the hobby. People that
>are interested tend to care about the hobby and will be good operators.

I am interested, and have been for my last 12 years, I can be a very good operator, I don't think learning code will make them better. AS you have said above, they have at most mild correlation. If you expire them, then some who don't feel like taking up the code would just let them expired, and forget about this whole hobby. The restriction on HF for no-coders is already a big incentive to get code if people want to.

>As a side note, the ARRL should consider promoting the GMRS frequencies
>for those that want general purpose 2-way radio communications. Yes,
>a proportion of the no-code techs just want a way of using a HT
>as a walkie talkie when they go camping. GMRS is better for them
>and it keeps them off the ham bands. Even if they learn code, they
>are unlikely to be really good operators, because they don't care.

You are saying some operators don't care (what?) and are not good operators, but what has that to do with code or not (you just said that too)? There are always people who are deviants in any group in the society. WE have been talking about code/no-code here, what has those proportion of bad operators has to do with it? Are you saying there are more bad operators among the no-code techs crowd? (you just said it) And how can you justify that gross generalization? I think without good back-up research/data in your accusation, it is hardly to stand. I think it is as much as saying black people are likely to be bad people, just because of their color.

>Ah yes, for those that just have to know, so they can form stereotypical
>notions, yes, I am a code-tech for the reasons stated above. Also,
>as netland says, the writtens are a joke. Passed all of them in
>one fell swoop. More on that later.... Now to get code to 20.....
> -Ken

You could be very proud of your coded-tech licence, the Canadian ones I just took are very very easy too for me (even Advanced), and I think they should be much harder (I have studied the US ones, and I think US Advanced is much harder than our same name). If it has been too easy, may be we want it harder, but putting code to "step up" the hardness is not the same.

I'd like to make an analogical comparison: how about drivers licence? In some countries, or long time ago, manual shift is manadatory, no matter what you will drive later, in the exam. Now, for an emergency situation,

like my friend's story: his friend broke his leg, and he has a stick-shift Porsche, my friend doesn't have a car, he needs to take his friend to the hospital, luckily he knows stick-shift. Now, based on this story, do you think we should mandate stick shift for all drivers' exams now? I think I have just provided a quite similar situation (only one is hobby, another one is more like life necessity).

I apologise on wasting this bandwidth, but just this is my first post on code/no-code talk.

Regards,
David

```
-----
| In real life: David Tse      E-mail: tpang@sfu.ca (Internet)      |
| Snail Mail: P.O. Box 26052, Richmond, B.C., V6Y 1Z3, Canada    |
| Home: Amiga A3000/25/100/6 + AMaxII + ZyXEL U-1496E + HP DeskJet PLUS |
-----
```

```
-----
Date: Thu, 13 May 1993 14:27:37 CET
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!newsserver.jvnc.net!gmd.de!dearn!esoc!
wkoehler@ames.arpa
Subject: Should auto mechanics learn how to shoe horses?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu
```

In article <C6xLCp.72x@news.cso.uiuc.edu>, apeters2@ux4.cso.uiuc.edu (Avram J. Peters) says:

>
>you were involved in amateur radio as a business?
>doesn't that mean that you were breaking the law?
>

Well, I guess I broke the law once or twice in my life (and maybe do it again some time). I also broke the law using amateur radio albeit under circumstances 'sans description', so we better do not discuss them here.

When I became a radio amateur I sometimes day-dreamed of being a professional ham radio operator. The dreams vanished and after a time I found myself as a professional ship's radio operator. 'twas in those days when you still had to rely on your CW skills to stay in touch with home and others.

Anyway, I am not at all opposed to modern communications techniques. Satellite communications are such an invaluable improvement, even though they make CW obsolete as far as the commercial use is concerned (not to speak of the radio operators not needed anymore).

As a skipper, I wouldn't throw my sextant and my nautical tables over

board just because I have GPS. Are you sure that these bloody birds will be still there when you need them? Well, I really should be gone now...

73 and have a nice day, Wolf.
DL3ZBJ, AB6EL, VK6BGV.

Date: Thu, 13 May 1993 13:52:21 CET
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
newsserver.jvnc.net!gmd.de!dearn!esoc!wkoehler@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Should auto mechanics learn how to shoe horses?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C6xALy.1MJ@ucdavis.edu>, ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd) says:

>
>I'll buy that, but in what way does that refute the arguement that CW is an
>antiquated mode....
> (stuff deleted)
>I don't use the old fashioned rythm nethod of birth control either, and
>that is certainly a hobby. Well *I* don't do it professionally anyway.

Antiquated or not, that is not the point because you don't h a v e to learn code to become a radio amateur and you don't h a v e to use CW when you are one. With a no-code license you can still operate your station, locally or world wide. The only drawback is that you are restricted to certain modes and certain frequency bands. If you want higher privileges, i. e. more bands available to you, you can overcome these restrictions by showing proof of higher knowledge, in our case learning code, in steps leading you to ever higher license classes until you have full privileges.

Sometimes I wonder what some of you think life is all about. More and more people seem to take everything for granted nowadays. Ever heard of having to work for or to learn something? Rules may be changed, but there have to be rules nevertheless. Life without rules is anarchy. Do you want anarchy?

And since you mentioned the rhythm-method of birth-control: Well, buddy, I still favor the old-fashioned method of making babies. It is antiquated, yes indeed, and there are much more sophisticated methods available today, but by golly, I wouldn't like to see the day when this method becomes obsolete.

So take one advice, old chum: Overcome your frustration, give yourself a new objective and learn CW. Learn it thoroughly, then you'll like it. And it's not the speed that counts, believe me.

Life c a n be fun, and so can CW.

73 and happy days, Wolf.
DL3ZBJ, AB6EL, VK6BGV.

Date: Thu, 13 May 1993 14:52:45 CET
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!newsserver.jvnc.net!gmd.de!
dearn!esoc!wkoehler@ames.arpa
Subject: Should auto mechanics learn how to shoe horses?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May13.082440.20340@ke4zv.uucp>, gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman)
says:

>
>It's true that many amateurs view the *service* as a passtime, like
>watching TV. And that's sad....

Sad it is indeed, Gary, for watching TV (in most cases) is
n o t a pastime, but more a w a s t e of time.

>Note that I hope that the amateur radio service is a bit more useful
>than watching TV in it's service to the public and humanity via it's
>self training and innovation in electronics as well as the more direct
>public service aspects. Still, if some see it only as a way to idle away
>the empty hours in front of a box tapping a key, there's no reason to
>impose their peculiar requirements on everyone else.

Oh, you're absolutely right, Gary, with the first part of your
statement. I can do nothing but stress it.

What seems a bit strange to me is your picture of a ham radio
operator as one sitting in front of a box tapping a key. That's
not me as a radio amateur, that's none of my ham friends.
(Well, sometimes it i s me but then I'm in my office.)
What you describe is either a computer freak or someone playing
silly games on a computer. Being a computer freak may be helpful
but doesn't qualify you as a radio amateur. My picture of a ham
is a different one. And using ham radio only as a means to connect
two machines to each other is also not my understanding of our
hobby.

There are, thanks God, so many aspects in ham radio to make almost
everyone happy if we are all tolerant enough to accept a few simple
facts of life: Live and let live.

73, Wolf.
DL3ZBJ, AB6EL, VK6BGV.

Date: 13 May 93 19:38:23 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: what is the issue here? (WAS: no-code defense)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

system@garlic.sbs.com (Anthony S. Pelliccio) writes:

>little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

>

>>> In rec.radio.amateur.misc kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan)
>>> writes:

>>>

>>>I can't specifically say, but I believe Tony is proposing to restructure
>>>access to V/UHF bands by license class, i.e. the non-coded tech would have
>>>access above 147.00. This would give non-coded techs an "incentive" (remember
>>>that folks, that's what our licensing system is supposed to have...) to
>>>upgrade beyond no-code.

>>

>> Excuse me, but where in Part 97 does it state that our licensing system is
>> supposed to have "incentives"? Or more specifically where does it codify
>> granting spectrum and privileges based upon unrelated examinations? Or is
>> a Morse code test somehow related to operating FM phone on the 2 meter
>> band? Or perhaps there is some wording in there like the current
>> administration's definition of increasing the tax on social security
>> benefits as a spending cut.

>

>Read part 97 over again. The general licensing structure indicates that
>it's incentive licensing. And how would the examinations be "unrelated"?

Which section of 97 *states* the *purpose* of the licensing structure is to
provide incentive? Is this a difficult question? Can I state it more
plainly? Also explain how a Morse code exam would be related to the
privileges granted on 147.00 - 148.00 MHz? Or do you guys in Rhode Island
utilize F2A emission on your repeaters instead of the more common F3E
emission the rest of the country uses?

>

>> I think the IARU had it right in 1985 when they were trying to push a
>> universal two tiered licensing structure. Amateurs would be automatically
>> granted operating privileges in whatever country they were traveling and
>> there would only be *two* classes of licenses. One would grant all
>> privileges on all amateur frequencies and would include a code test (they
>> must have felt the ITU wasn't ready to completely drop the code
>> requirement). The other would grant all privileges on all amateur
>> frequencies above 144 MHz and would not require a code test.

>
>Actually I think the US license structure, with a bit of modification
>would be perfect for worldwide use.

Right. Name a country with a more baroque licensing structure?

>> I'll have to look back and see whatever happened to that effort. Sounds
>> like the right direction to me. This other path seems headed towards
>> requiring an attorney at your station to interpret Part 97 and verify that
>> you have proper authorization to turn on your radio. ;-)

>
>Either that or someone with a brain, unlike you.

Oh oh, you're so witty. I wish I could have come up with such a deeply wounding comment. Perhaps you should resort to foul language. It might help your argument. It certainly couldn't hurt it.

By the way, I can't *wait* to see your "NPRM". I hadn't realized the FCC had relocated its offices to Rhode Island and started using the sbs nodes for their internet access.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: Thu, 13 May 1993 18:07:33 GMT
From: swrinde!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!rsg1.er.usgs.gov!
resdgs1.er.usgs.gov!tbodoh@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: what is the issue here? (WAS: no-code defense)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May13.173845.11612@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>, little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

|>
|> By the way, I can't *wait* to see your "NPRM". I hadn't realized the FCC
|> had relocated its offices to Rhode Island and started using the sbs nodes
|> for their internet access.
|>
|> 73,
|> Todd
|> N9MWB

--
The question just begging to be asked is - what does SBS do? Is the company ham related or what? I've seen a lot of CONTROVERSIAL (to be kind) posts coming from there and one starts to wonder what type of business this is.


```
+++++
+ Tom Bodoh - Sr. systems software engineer
+
+ USGS/EROS Data Center, Sioux Falls, SD, USA 57198      (605) 594-6830      +
+ Internet; bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (152.61.192.66)
+
+   "Welcome back my friends to the show that never ends!" EL&P
+
+++++
```

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #143
